

Vacuum polarization for neutral particles in 2+1 dimensions*

Qiong-gui Lin[†]

China Center of Advanced Science and Technology (World Laboratory),

P.O.Box 8730, Beijing 100080, People's Republic of China

and

Department of Physics, Zhongshan University, Guangzhou 510275,

People's Republic of China[‡]

In 2+1 dimensions there exists a duality between a charged Dirac particle coupled minimally to a background vector potential and a neutral one coupled nonminimally to a background electromagnetic field strength. A constant uniform background electric current induces in the vacuum of the neutral particle a fermion current which is proportional to the background one. A background electromagnetic plane wave induces no current in the vacuum. For constant but nonuniform background electric charge, known results for charged particles can be translated to give the induced fermion number. Some new examples with infinite background electric charge are presented. The induced spin and total angular momentum are also discussed.

PACS number(s): 11.10.Kk, 03.70.+k, 11.15.Tk

Keywords: vacuum polarization, neutral particles, induced charge, induced current, induced spin

*published in J. Phys. G **26** (2000) L17-L21.

[†]E-mail addresses: qg_lin@163.net, stdp@zsu.edu.cn

[‡]Mailing address

Vacuum polarization for charged Dirac particles in 2+1 dimensions has been studied by many authors in recent years [1-14]. The subject is relevant to many other physical problems in field theory, such as parity violation, Chern–Simons theory [15-16], flavor symmetry breaking, etc. The purpose of this note is to extend the subject to neutral particles. A neutral particle of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ with magnetic moment can interact with electromagnetic fields through nonminimal coupling. The Dirac equation for the neutral fermion field ψ is [17]

$$(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - \frac{1}{2}\mu_n\sigma^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} - m_n)\psi = 0, \quad (1)$$

where m_n is the mass of the fermion and μ_n its magnetic moment, $F_{\mu\nu}$ is the external electromagnetic field strength, γ^μ the Dirac matrices and

$$\sigma^{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2}[\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]. \quad (2)$$

A well known indication of the above nonminimal interaction is the Aharonov–Casher effect [18] which has been observed in experiment [19]. In 2+1 dimensions there are two inequivalent irreducible representations for the Dirac matrices. The first one is

$$\gamma^0 = \sigma^3, \quad \gamma^1 = i\sigma^1, \quad \gamma^2 = i\sigma^2, \quad (3)$$

where the σ 's are Pauli matrices. In this and all equivalent representations we have

$$\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu = g^{\mu\nu} - i\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\gamma_\lambda, \quad (4)$$

where $g^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1)$, $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}$ is totally antisymmetric in its indices and $\epsilon^{012} = 1$. The second one is

$$\gamma^0 = -\sigma^3, \quad \gamma^1 = -i\sigma^1, \quad \gamma^2 = -i\sigma^2. \quad (5)$$

In this and all equivalent representations we have

$$\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu = g^{\mu\nu} + i\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\gamma_\lambda. \quad (6)$$

On account of the above relations we have

$$\sigma^{\mu\nu} = \pm\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\gamma_\lambda, \quad (7)$$

where the upper (lower) sign corresponds to the first (second) representation. (The same rule is applied henceforth.) Let us define

$$a^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\lambda\rho}F_{\lambda\rho}. \quad (8)$$

Then in 2+1 dimensions Eq. (1) becomes

$$[i\gamma^\mu(\partial_\mu \pm i\mu_n a_\mu) - m_n]\psi = 0. \quad (9)$$

Now we write down the Dirac equation for a charged particle in a background electromagnetic vector potential A_μ^e :

$$[i\gamma^\mu(\partial_\mu + ieA_\mu^e) - m_e]\psi_e = 0, \quad (10)$$

where we use a subscript (or superscript) e to indicate a charged particle. Comparing Eqs. (9) and (10) one easily realizes that a_μ plays the same role to the neutral particle as A_μ^e to the charged one, and $\pm\mu_n$ corresponds to e . This duality has been noticed in the study of the Aharonov–Casher effect. Consequently, constant uniform fields $F_{\mu\nu}$ have no physical effect on neutral particles. Because of the above duality, we call a_μ the dual vector potential, and

$$f_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu a_\nu - \partial_\nu a_\mu \quad (11)$$

the dual field strength. Actually, a_μ is a pseudovector and $f_{\mu\nu}$ a pseudotensor. Thus there is an essential difference between Eq. (9) and Eq. (10) in spite of their similar appearance: Eq. (10) is invariant under the space reflection $(x^0, x^1, x^2) \rightarrow (x^0, -x^1, x^2)$ if $m_e = 0$, while Eq. (9) is not even when $m_n = 0$.

For charged particles it has been shown [1] by Schwinger’s method of proper time [20] that a current is induced in the vacuum by a constant uniform background electromagnetic field $F_{\mu\nu}^e$:

$$j_e^\mu \equiv \langle 0 | \frac{1}{2} [\bar{\psi}_e, \gamma^\mu \psi_e] | 0 \rangle = \pm \frac{e}{8\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\lambda\rho} F_{\lambda\rho}^e. \quad (12)$$

It represents the induced electric current in the vacuum if multiplied by e . By the duality between Eq. (9) and Eq. (10), and using the above result, we have for the neutral particle a similar one. If $f_{\mu\nu}$ is constant and uniform, we have an induced fermion current in the vacuum of the neutral particle:

$$j_n^\mu \equiv \langle 0 | \frac{1}{2} [\bar{\psi}, \gamma^\mu \psi] | 0 \rangle = \frac{\mu_n}{8\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\lambda\rho} f_{\lambda\rho}. \quad (13)$$

Note that the lower (minus) sign in (12) corresponds to the second representation of the Dirac matrices, and in this representation the counterpart of e is $-\mu_n$, thus the result (13) is independent of the choice of the representation. This is different from the case for charged particles. Substituting Eqs. (8) and (11) into (13) and using the (2+1)-dimensional Maxwell equation $\partial_\lambda F^{\lambda\mu} = J^\mu$ where J^μ is the source current producing the field $F_{\mu\nu}$, we obtain

$$j_n^\mu = -\frac{\mu_n}{4\pi} J^\mu. \quad (14)$$

Therefore the induced fermion current is proportional to the electric source one. Some remarks on the result: First, the result holds for constant and uniform J^μ (or $f_{\mu\nu}$), but $F_{\mu\nu}$ is necessarily nonuniform or nonconstant. Second, if A_μ^e (and thus $F_{\mu\nu}^e$) is a plane wave, we can show that Eq. (12) holds as well [21]. Consequently, if $F_{\mu\nu}$ (and thus a_μ) is a plane wave, Eq. (13) or (14) is valid. However, in this case $J^\mu = 0$, thus a background electromagnetic plane wave induces no current. This is different from the case for charged particles. Third, for time-independent but nonuniform J^0 , Eq. (14) does not hold locally, but an integrated form does hold if the background total charge is finite. For large total background charge, the local form holds approximately. But it does not necessarily hold exactly for all situations with infinite background charge. These are discussed in the following. For nonuniform $\mathbf{J}$, little is known to us at present.

The zero component of Eq. (12) was widely studied in the literature [2-6]. Though the local form does not hold for nonuniform magnetic field, an integrated form does hold provided

that the total magnetic flux is finite. Translated to our case, a corresponding result for the neutral particle read

$$Q_n \equiv \int j_n^0(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = -\frac{\mu_n Q}{4\pi}, \quad (15)$$

where $Q = \int J^0(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ is the total background electric charge (divided by e). That is, the induced fermion number in the vacuum is proportional to the background electric charge. For charged particles, of particular interest is the special case of an Aharonov–Bohm flux string [8-11, 13]. This corresponds in the neutral case to a pointlike background charge. Eq. (15) holds in this case according to the previous conclusion for the Aharonov–Bohm flux string. It is argued that the zero component of (12) holds approximately as a local relation for large total magnetic flux [14]. (Though the main attention in Ref. [14] is paid to the flavor condensate, the argument is applicable to the induced charge.) Correspondingly, a local form of (15) is expected to hold approximately for large Q . However, we will see below that even for infinite Q , the local form does not necessarily hold exactly.

Vacuum induced spin (S) and angular momentum (J) were also studied for charged particles in the literature [5-7, 13]. Translated to our case, we have for finite Q the following results.

$$\lim_{m_n \rightarrow 0} S = \mp \frac{|\mu_n Q|}{8\pi}, \quad (16)$$

$$J = \mp \frac{(\mu_n Q)^2}{16\pi^2}, \quad (17)$$

where the density of spin (s) and angular momentum (j) is defined as

$$s = \langle 0 | \frac{1}{4} [\psi^\dagger, \sigma^3 \psi] | 0 \rangle, \quad (18)$$

$$j = \langle 0 | \frac{1}{2} [\psi^\dagger, (l + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^3) \psi] | 0 \rangle, \quad (19)$$

where $l = xp_y - yp_x$ is the orbital angular momentum. Antisymmetrization in the above definition is necessary so that the expressions are invariant under charge conjugation ($\mu_n \rightarrow -\mu_n$ for neutral particles).

In the following we consider some special examples with infinite background electric charge. We denote $\rho = J^0$ and $\rho_n = j_n^0$, and confine ourselves to situations where ρ depends only on a polar coordinate r such that the Dirac equation can be solved in the polar coordinates (r, θ) . If $\rho(r)$ behaves like $r^{-2+\delta_1}$ when $r \rightarrow 0$ and like $r^{-2+\delta_2}$ when $r \rightarrow \infty$ with $\delta_1 > 0$, $\delta_2 > 0$, then the electric charge in any finite area is finite but the total charge is divergent. In these cases there are infinitely many (denumerable) bound-state solutions with threshold energy $E = m_n$ or $-m_n$, and no scattering solution with the above threshold energies. This is rather different from those cases with finite background charge, where the number of threshold bound states is finite and threshold scattering solutions are also present [22-23]. The current situation with infinite charge seems simpler. Vacuum polarizations (induced charge, spin, angular momentum, etc.) are determined by the threshold solutions. Since the method of calculation is well established in the literature, we only give the following results.

$$\rho_n(r) = -\frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(\mu_n q_\infty) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} u_m^2(r), \quad (20)$$

$$\lim_{m_n \rightarrow 0} s(r) = \mp \frac{1}{4} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} u_m^2(r), \quad (21)$$

$$j(r) = \mp \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (m + \frac{1}{2}) u_m^2(r), \quad (22)$$

where

$$u_m(r) = A_m r^m \exp \left[- \left| \int_0^r \frac{\mu_n q(r')}{2\pi r'} dr' \right| \right], \quad (23)$$

$$q(r) = \int_0^r 2\pi r' \rho(r') dr', \quad (24)$$

and q_∞ represents $q(r)$ at large r . Obviously, $q(r)$ is the background charge inside the circle with radius r . If $\rho(r)$ has the same sign for all r , then $\text{sign}(\mu_n q_\infty) = \text{sign}(\mu_n \rho)$. The coefficient A_m in Eq. (23) is determined by the normalization condition

$$\int_0^\infty 2\pi r u_m^2(r) dr = 1. \quad (25)$$

From the above results we see that there exists a local relation between $\rho_n(r)$ and $\lim_{m_n \rightarrow 0} s(r)$:

$$\lim_{m_n \rightarrow 0} s(r) = \pm \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(\mu_n q_\infty) \rho_n(r). \quad (26)$$

It is not clear whether this relation holds in other charge configurations without cylindrical symmetry. It is also not clear whether it holds in situations with finite background charge, because the contribution from scattering threshold states is subtle. However, an integrated relation does hold when the background charge is finite. [cf. Eqs. (15) and (16).]

When $\rho(r) \propto r^{-2+\delta}$ with $\delta > 0$, exact expressions are available for all the above quantities. However, closed forms can be acquired only when $\delta = 1, 2, 4$. It is worth noting that the Dirac equation can be completely solved when $\delta = 1, 2$. The case $\delta = 2$ corresponds to the one with constant uniform charge density discussed above. Calculation of $\rho_n(r)$ by using the above expressions confirms the previous result (14) (the zero component). The results for the other two cases are given below. Since $\lim_{m_n \rightarrow 0} s(r)$ is related to $\rho_n(r)$ by (26), and $j(r)$ is not very interesting (and also complicated when $\delta = 4$), we only write down the results for $\rho_n(r)$. When $\rho(r) = \lambda_1/r$, we have

$$\rho_n(r) = -\frac{\mu_n \rho(r)}{4\pi} [1 - \exp(-4|\mu_n \lambda_1| r)], \quad (27)$$

while when $\rho(r) = \lambda_2 r^2$, we have

$$\rho_n(r) = -\frac{\mu_n \rho(r)}{8\pi} \left[1 + \text{erf} \left(\sqrt{\frac{|\mu_n \lambda_2|}{8}} r^2 \right) \right] - \text{sign}(\mu_n \lambda_2) \frac{\sqrt{|\mu_n \lambda_2|}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{|\mu_n \lambda_2|}{8} r^4 \right), \quad (28)$$

where λ_1, λ_2 are constants, and

$$\text{erf}(\xi) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\xi e^{-\eta^2} d\eta.$$

Although the background charge is infinite, the local relation (14) (the zero component) is not valid. It holds approximately only when λ_1 or λ_2 is large. The above results can be translated to the case of charged particles. However, it should be pointed out that the significance of these examples is limited since the situation is difficult to realize in practice.

As in the case of charged particles, one may consider a four-component form of the theory with $\gamma^0 = \text{diag}(\sigma^3, -\sigma^3)$, $\gamma^1 = \text{diag}(i\sigma^1, -i\sigma^1)$, $\gamma^2 = \text{diag}(i\sigma^2, -i\sigma^2)$. It is then invariant under the space reflection $(x^0, x^1, x^2) \rightarrow (x^0, -x^1, x^2)$. In this case, the induced spin and angular momentum in the vacuum both vanish. But the induced charge is twice that given above, which is rather different from the case of charged particles. Further more, there is no flavor or chiral symmetry even when $m_n = 0$, which is also different from the case of charged particles. Therefore it is meaningless to speak about flavor symmetry breaking in this theory.

Recently, the duality between neutral and charged particles has been used to calculate the probability of neutral particle-antiparticle pair creation in the vacuum by external electromagnetic fields in 2+1 dimensions [24]. Unfortunately, nontrivial results in 3+1 dimensions are still not available. On the other hand, Eq. (1) has been solved in some spherically symmetric electric fields in 3+1 dimensions [25], and spectral asymmetry similar to that in 2+1 dimensions is found. Therefore vacuum polarizations for neutral particles in 3+1 dimensions can be expected. This will be studied subsequently.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China.

-
- [1] A. N. Redlich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** (1984) 18; Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 2366.
 - [2] A. J. Niemi and G. W. Semenoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 2077; Phys. Rep. **135** (1986) 99.
 - [3] I. V. Krive and A. S. Rozhanskii, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **152** (1987) 33 [Sov. Phys. Usp. **30** (1987) 370].
 - [4] D. Boyanovsky and R. Blankenbecler, Phys. Rev. D **31** (1985) 3234.
 - [5] D. Boyanovsky, R. Blankenbecler, and R. Yahalom, Nucl. Phys. B **270** (1986) 483.
 - [6] A. P. Polychronakos, Nucl. Phys. B **278** (1986) 207; Phys. Rev. Lett. **60** (1988) 1920.
 - [7] M. B. Paranjape, Phys. Rev. D **36** (1987) 3766.
 - [8] T. Jaroszewicz, Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986) 3128.

- [9] R. R. Parwani and A. S. Goldhaber, Nucl. Phys. B **359** (1991) 483.
- [10] E. G. Flekkoy and J. M. Leinaas, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **6** (1991) 5327.
- [11] V. B. Bezerra and E. R. Bezerra de Mello, Class. Quant. Grav. **11** (1994) 457.
- [12] V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky, and I. A. Shovkovy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 3499.
- [13] R. R. Parwani, Phys. Lett. B **358** (1995) 101; Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **11** (1996) 1715.
- [14] G. Dunne and T. Hall, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 2220.
- [15] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, and S. Templeton, Ann. Phys. (NY) **140** (1982) 372.
- [16] C. R. Hagen, Ann. Phys. (NY) **157** (1984) 342.
- [17] C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980).
- [18] Y. Aharonov and A. Casher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53** (1984) 319; A. S. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 482.
- [19] C. Cimmino, G. I. Opat, A. G. Klein, H. Kaiser, S. A. Werner, M. Arif, and R. Clothier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 380.
- [20] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **82** (1951) 664.
- [21] Q.-G. Lin, unpublished.
- [22] Y. Aharonov and A. Casher, Phys. Rev. A **19** (1979) 2461.
- [23] R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 2375.
- [24] Q.-G. Lin, J. Phys. G **25** (1999) 1793.
- [25] Q.-G. Lin, Phys. Rev. A **61** (2000) 022101.